



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The fact that the *ἰχνευταί* are most naturally conceived as a pack of hounds, and Silenos, who is not explicitly named, as their hunt-master, leads to an interesting discussion of the whole vexed question of Satyrs and Silens on the Athenian stage, which there is no space to summarize. I am pleased to see that in Aeschylus fr. 207: *τράγος γένειον ἄρα πενθήσεις σύ γε*, Professor von Wilamowitz agrees that the nominative cannot be taken as vocative. But he tries to "save his goat" by assimilating the construction to that of Sophocles fr. 182: *ἐρινὸς ἄλλους ἐξερινάζεις λόγῳ*. The text of this is doubtful. But even if we accept Wilamowitz' text, surely the point of the line lies in the etymologizing pun and teasing repetition of *ἐρινός* in *ἐξερινάζεις*. There is nothing of this in *τράγος γένειον*, which, as I tried to show in *Class. Phil.*, IV, 433, belongs grammatically and idiomatically in the category of *rusticus exspectat* and *κύων ἐπέρησα χαράδρην*.

The latter part of the essay gives Wilamowitz' present views of the origin of the Greek drama. The vaticinations of the English folklorist school are rejected *in toto* (p. 24): "*petitio principii* und schillernde Möglichkeiten sind üble Surrogate des Beweises." He insists particularly upon their hopeless confusion of conjectural prehistoric religion in any part of the world with the actual development of the drama in Attica. It is this last which we wish to know; and it is this which we must presume Aristotle to have known even when he neglects to tell us the details. There remains the difficulty of transition from the *λέξις γελοία* and saltatory trochaic tetrameter of "satyric" tragedy to Aeschylus' mighty line. Wilamowitz cuts rather than unties the knot by the personal genius of Aeschylus and an eloquent appeal to the mutation theory of evolution in botany and the Carlylean gospel of the great man in history. The footnotes throughout this pregnant and suggestive paper teem with ideas which no student of the Greek drama can afford to overlook.

PAUL SHOREY

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Der Orient und die frühgriechische Kunst. VON FREDERIK POULSEN.
Leipzig: Teubner, 1912. Pp. vi+195, with 196 illustrations
in the text. M. 12.

Poulsen's purpose in this book, as he himself states it (p. 3), is to show "how the Greek orientalizing style came into being." His method is to analyze carefully a large number of works of the ninth, eighth, and seventh centuries B.C., especially works of minor art, and by this means to attempt to determine the elements of the orientalizing style and to trace them back to their origin in Egyptian, Assyrian, Hittite, and Phoenician art.

Such a book is impossible to criticize in detail in the brief limits of a review. The validity of the argument depends, in almost every case, on

the cumulative force of a mass of evidence, and this can be seen only by reading the book itself. Every reader can select single statements and arguments that do not seem to him so significant as the author would have us believe, but a long list of such points, taken out of their connection, would not really affect the validity of the argument as a whole. Under these circumstances, the best that a reviewer can do is to state the conclusions and the tendencies of the book and hope thus to inspire others to investigate the arguments for themselves. This the present reviewer is the more inclined to do, because he finds himself so closely in agreement with many of the views advanced.

In general, Poulsen's attitude toward the question of the origin of the orientalizing style may be characterized as eclectic. He holds, clearly, that the problem is more complex than it has been thought to be by many critics. The *Panionismus* which has had so much vogue in recent years has no charms for him, and he is especially severe in his strictures on the *Pankretismus* of Loewy's recent attempt to trace practically all the orientalizing motives of early Greek art back to Crete (cf. *Jahresh. oest. Inst.*, XII [1910], 243-304, and XIV [1912], 1-34). He does not deny the importance of Ionic and Cretan influence, but he does deny that Ionia or Crete was the exclusive (or even the most important) intermediary between the east and the west. The important intermediaries he finds rather in Cyprus and Rhodes, above all in Phoenicia. Indeed, the most striking feature of the book is the very successful attempt which Poulsen makes to rehabilitate the Phoenicians, whose importance it has been the fashion in recent years to minimize. The earlier chapters are devoted to a careful and illuminating analysis of the famous bronze bowls from Nimrud; the bronze and silver bowls from Cyprus, Crete, the Greek mainland, and Italy; the carved ivories from Nimrud and elsewhere; the so-called *tridacna* shells from different sites; and various other objects that have been brought into connection with Phoenician art. Poulsen argues convincingly for the Phoenician origin of most of these objects, and uses them constantly in the later chapters to prove Phoenician influence in works found in Greece and Italy.

The titles of the later chapters and their conclusions are as follows: chap. vi, "The Cretan Shields" (these are close copies by Cretan workmen of Phoenician shields, showing almost no originality); vii, "Early Rhodian Art" (it was strongly influenced by Phoenician products, but here we see the earliest manifestation of the Greek spirit, transforming the oriental models); viii, "The Ivory Figures from the Artemisium at Ephesus" (they show little direct Phoenician influence; they were affected rather by Rhodian prototypes and by the art of Asia Minor, which was largely under the influence of Hittite art); ix, "Oriental Elements in Greek Geometric Art" (such elements are rare; they were drawn from Phoenician, Cypriote, Cretan, and Ionic sources); x, "Finds in Italy" (here there was little direct imitation of Phoenician works; the earlier orientalizing products exhibit

principally oriental forms as they were developed in Cyprus, the later show a preponderance of Rhodian and Ionic influence); xi, "The Figures with the *Etagenperücke*" (these figures, in which the hair appears as a wiglike mass in horizontal layers, represent a mode of wearing the hair which was introduced into Greece from Phoenicia toward the end of the eighth century B.C., probably through the mediation of Rhodes); xii, "The Significance of Early Cretan Art (Cretan art in the Dark Ages is Byzantine in character, i.e., an art which long preserved the traditions of an earlier and more splendid development, and which only rose to new importance when quickened by contact with the fresher, more living art of Ionia); xiii, "The Monuments and the Homeric Poems" (Helbig was more nearly right than Reichel and Drerup in turning to the monuments of the Dark Ages rather than to those of the Mycenaean Age for the study of Homeric *Realien*; in the poems, Phoenician influence is paramount in matters of art, and the monuments described show closer analogies to post-Mycenaean than to Mycenaean works; Homeric armor and Homeric dress, also, are best illustrated by the monuments of the post-Mycenaean period; the poems had their origin in some region of Asia Minor where oriental influence was strong).

Such a brief summary may suggest the wide range of Poulsen's investigations. It gives no idea of the wide knowledge and the keen observation that he everywhere displays. One is somewhat surprised to find no reference in the final chapter to Lang's theory of the "moment of culture," even if it were only introduced to be denied all probability. But such omissions are rare. In general, Poulsen's knowledge of recent literature seems no less comprehensive than his knowledge of the monuments.

For the archaeologist the principal value of this work will be found in the lists of monuments and the proposed criteria for distinguishing the products of different centers. The philologist will probably find the last chapter the most interesting. But the book deserves the serious attention of all who are interested in the fascinating problem of the origin of Greek civilization.

GEORGE H. CHASE

HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Apollonius Rhodius: The Argonautica. With an English Translation by R. C. SEATON, M.A. "Loeb Classical Library." New York: Macmillan, 1912. \$1.50.

Mr. Seaton has rendered the *Argonautica* into English prose that reproduces very closely the movement of the original. In point of diction he strikes a happy mean; the reader's attention is not arrested by obtrusive archaic forms, nor yet is the language wanting in dignity and elevation. The translation moves rapidly and carries the reader along easily. While it is closely made it has freedom as well, and shows on every page the art of